

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
January 22, 2002
Revised February 5, 2002

Interest Group Committee:

Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Allison Rolfe	San Diego Audubon
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Chris Anderson	San Diego Association of Realtors
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Reed Morgan	American Institute of Architects (Note – unauthorized alternate)
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Constance Clover	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Dave Shibley	
David Pallinger	Ramona
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Kris Preston	Valley Center/Friends of Hellhole Canyon
Lael Montgomery	Valley Center
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Nabil Chehade	
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Pat Flanagan	
Rich Cantillon	
Ruth Potter	
Scott Molloy	J. Whalen Associates
Tom Ward	Manzanita Indian Tribe

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Timothy Popejoy (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)
Jonathan Smulian (WRT)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for January 8, 2002
 - No changes were made. Adams moved to approve, Messer seconded. Minutes approved.
- b) Distribution of Draft Revisions to Goals & Policies
 - The Goals & Policies were made available at this meeting for discussion on February 5th. The draft revisions will be emailed as requested.
- c) Overview
 - Scarborough briefed the group of last week's status report to the Board of Supervisors. There were supportive comments made by the Board and essentially, what was said is that staff will be back with a draft map. The Steering Committee, on January 12th, directed staff to digitize this draft for review, however, they are not endorsing anything yet.

Agenda Item II: Map Review –

- a) Discussion
 - The group agreed that they have had enough meetings to look at the map in detail.
 - Silver stated that he was uncomfortable digitizing the draft and feels there needs to be corrections made.
 - Whalen asked what it meant when it goes to be digitized. Holler responded that by entering the densities shown on the overlay into the computer, it allows us to model for different things, i.e. population, acreages, etc. Smulian added that it is the basis for modeling, it brings in the constraints, and provides a basis for making decisions.
 - Silver had identified areas as a proposal for corrections prior to digitization. Some areas of 1 du/40 ac, east of CWA, should change to 1 du/80 ac. Suggested staff make modest changes and add 1 du/160 ac to areas, such as, Rancho Guajito, Rutherford, and Mesa Grande. West of CWA, he feels there is a significant problem with Pauma Valley. Suggested minor modifications and to have it digitized as in draft form, but not exactly, so as to allow time for the group to work with the Farm Bureau. Feels it is a sprawl issue and that there is a need to think of planning solutions and consider it a special planning area. He realizes that the area south of the highway, 1 du/10 ac, is a mistake that has been changed already. Area of 1 du/4 ac should be 1 du/10 ac. Acknowledges that the 1 du/10 ac on the valley floor needs a planning solution. Does not want to lose the Farm Bureau and suggested making it a special plan area. Understands that the SPA on the eastern edge of the Ramona grasslands is being processed right now, however, he suggested also calling this area out as a special plan area and to look at clustering to keep development on the eastern edge. Feels eastern Jamul's 1 du/10 ac should be 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/40 ac. Feels Harmony Grove/Escondido Creek area should be 1 du/10, 20, and 40 ac. Wants staff to defend the boundary between rural and estate in Valley Center's Rancho Lilac area. Thinks industrial is wrong in Tecate and suggested another special study area.
 - Messer requested staff to reassess the boundary in the Rancho Lilac area.
 - Larson stated a need for concurrence that these are actual errors so as to not make staff reiterate the map. Feels digitized info should show the other constraints, such as roads.
 - Adams stated that he did not see Harmony Grove as an error and that if there are going to be changes to downzones, then there needs to be upzones.
 - Messer wants to make the dividing line in Valley Center at the top of the slope and feels Keys Creek would better reflect the existing pattern of development. Stated that the strips of parcels along the Escondido Creek area are large parcels, with no rooftops and sensitive riparian resources. Feels there are areas in eastern Jamul that are very patchy and will probably remain, however, there may be some room for reassessment. La Jolla Indian Reservation inholdings should change from 1 du/40 ac to 1 du/80 ac. Part of Mesa Grande is parcelized but has a higher elevation, so it should be set at 1 du/160 ac.
 - Bowlby stated that he is not comfortable digitizing the map without the changes being made. Areas east of CWA has more 40s than 80s, and no 160s. Thinks that this pattern has too much sprawl. Thinks there should be 1 du/80 ac along rivers and streams.

❖ **Addition made at the February 5, 2002 meeting:** Bowlby stated that Pauma Valley had a higher density across over two miles for a village center, which is far too much for a valley, and the map, in general, encourages too much estate sprawl, which cannot be justified from a Smart Growth perspective.

- Chase asked when we get the population numbers and what the interaction is for the Circulation element. Pryor responded that we need to establish the land use pattern first and then see what it does to the roads, then make choices on roads versus land use.
- Gendron stated that Highway 94 is not at LOS F now but will be if Tecate is upzoned. Believes that sewer could easily be extended in Alpine and does not trust the word “appropriate.” Thinks that we need to take a better look at where the metro lines are going to be.
- Whalen stated that there are areas where the CWA can be arbitrary due to the comments in Pauma Valley. He does not have a problem with the 40s and 80s and thinks it should be topographically based and done on intact landscape rather than biology.
- **Motion:** Whalen moved to have the map moved ahead for digitizing and to continue to discuss the issue areas. Piro seconded the motion.
- Elias asked where the employment centers are to be located, what the assumptions and the land uses are, and what resources will be available and studies done. She asked if there will be an opportunity for this group to evaluate the question of where people are driving to. Pryor responded that crossing jurisdictions is SANDAG. Staff does factor in the Temecula road trips into this county. We will be back at that part of the process when we know where the population is distributed because we have to ensure there is enough industrial and commercial to compensate for residential.
- Messer thinks it would be better to start with a stronger map than a weaker map and commented on the amount of adjustments: 40s to 80s in an “acceptable location”, Valley Center’s Lilac area – distinction between semi-rural and rural, and Elfin Forest – high resource value and not highly parcelized.
- Piro feels that the map needs to be transit-oriented, thinks we need to address more job sites and industrial sites to avoid long commutes, and there should be attached residential and mixed use included in the village core.
- **Amendment:** Piro modified the motion to have staff assess the issues/comments made by the committee today, make the appropriate changes, and come back with a digitized map.
- **Final Motion:** Staff will assess the following issues: to follow the concepts more closely in Eastern Jamul, Elfin Forest/Harmony Grove/Escondido Creek, Keys Creek/Lilac, and Pauma Valley; assess 1 du/40 ac to 1 du/80 ac (based on intact landscape principles) on the inholdings within the La Jolla Indian Reservation, north of Wilderness Gardens, and Scissors Crossing; assess 1 du/80 ac to 1 du/160 ac at Mesa Grande, desert areas, Rancho Guajito, and the eastern slopes of Palomar; intensify the yellow areas adjacent to villages; explore a transit-oriented plan and more transit opportunities, employment and industrial areas more, and attached residential and mixed uses; river corridors; and Tecate, Ramona, and Pauma. Staff will make the appropriate changes and come back with a digitized map and will identify any changes with supporting information.
- **Vote:** 15 – 0 – 1 (Bowlby abstained)

Agenda Item III: Process –

- Goals & Policies will be addressed on February 5th and we will anticipate review of a digitized map on February 19th.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –

- Dutch Van Dierendonck stated he has concerns of the political aspects of the county. Basically, stated that we need to continue and then look at the map more closely when it is digitized.
- Kevin Bernard stated that the map does not reflect what the community desires in the Harmony Grove area.
- Mike Thometz asked what the costs were to run the map. Smulian responded with \$5,000 to digitize the map.

- Dave Shibley stated that if we preserve the backcountry, then someone needs to take the density.
- Ron Pennock stated that his group did their own mapping and population numbers and they do not match the county's mapping model.
- Brent McDonald stated that by putting in the land use and dealing with the infrastructure later is a difficult approach considering some roads cannot be widened due to political, environmental, and cost constraints. Suggests concentrating yellow to red so people can walk instead of drive and that we need to look at job centers and mixed use.